

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
SCHOOL FACILITIES COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2005**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter A. Alcorn, At-Large
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District
Laurie Frost Wilson, At-Large

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kaye Kory, Mason District
Kathy Smith, Sully District
Tessie Wilson, Braddock District

OTHER PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

James R. Hart, At-Large
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gary Chevalier, Director, Office Facilities Planning Services, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS)
Barbara Byron, Director, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
Donna McNeally, Assistant Division Director, ZED, DPZ
Dean Tistadt, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Facilities and Transportation Services, FCPS
Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk, Planning Commission
Henri Stein McCartney, Management Analyst, Planning Commission Office

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Suzanne F. Harsel, in the Board of Supervisors' Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 20035.

//

Chairman Harsel commented that after taking a class on cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and Automated External Defibrillators (AEDs), it had occurred to her that it might be possible to ask telecommunications carriers to proffer to provide AEDs to schools when they located their

facilities on school property. She said that Virginia State Delegate J. Chapman Petersen had introduced a bill in the General Assembly which, if passed, would provide some funding for AEDs to be placed in schools. Chairman Harsel noted that although Braddock District Supervisor Sharon Bulova had tasked the County and the Schools to develop a policy for the use of AEDs, she had yet to be notified that such a policy had been established and asked the School representatives to comment on this matter. Braddock District School Board Member Tessie Wilson replied that a policy had not yet been formulated. Dean Tistadt, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Facilities and Transportation Services, FCPS, said he would find out what progress had been made toward this and report back to the Committee.

//

Proceeding to agenda topics, Mr. Chevalier distributed a handout on student yield ratios, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that the formula to determine how many students would be generated by a specific type of dwelling was based on these ratios. He explained that the same ratios used for 2001-02 had been used for 2003 because there had been little change and also because there was some benefit to having stability in both the process and the formula.

Commissioner Alcorn noted that the Residential Development Criteria implementation motion required an annual adjustment for both the student yield calculations and capital construction costs.

In response to a question from Chairman Harsel, Mr. Chevalier said that student yield was calculated at the elementary, middle, and high school levels separately, not on the total yield of all levels. Responding to another question from Chairman Harsel, Mr. Chevalier said that enrollment projections were based on individual schools and their history, not necessarily on the Countywide average because staffing and budgeting depended on accurate projections which could be higher or lower on a case-by-case basis. Furthermore, Mr. Chevalier explained that even though Schools responded to the initial application with an estimate of the number of students generated, he generally waited until the rezoning process had been completed before projecting the number of students it would generate so the count would be more accurate.

Chairman Harsel commented that often three or four families lived in a single family home and asked if that had been considered in the student projections. Mr. Chevalier responded that if it were known in what areas doubling up occurred, ratios from those areas were used as factors in the projections. He added that since 1970 there had been an annual increase in enrollment, from several hundred to several thousand students. He said, however, this past year, in spite of new housing and new jobs, enrollment had decreased by 600 students. Chairman Harsel said this might be due to the fact that children were attending private schools to avoid complying with Standards of Learning requirements.

Referring again to the implementation motion, Commissioner Alcorn pointed out that another area to review, in addition to the yield calculations and the capital construction costs, was the level of service adjustment, although he did not think it had changed significantly.

Commissioner Hart commented that the ratios might be different if new housing and geographic areas were considered instead of just looking at the overall averages and that such information would be helpful to Commissioners when considering an application. Mr. Chevalier agreed that if individual projects were considered, the ratios would be much different than the ratios presented tonight. He pointed out, however, Countywide averages had been proven over time and could be defended.

Tessie Wilson asked if higher proffer amounts would result if calculations were based on geographic areas. Ms. Byron responded that using geographic areas would be advantageous if accurate numbers were needed for a particular school, but that the guidelines had been developed on a Countywide basis using a tried and true methodology that was equitable across the board. Mr. Chevalier added that both the yield ratio and the dollar amount could change if calculations were based on geographic area.

Commissioner Alcorn pointed out that since there was a difference between routine and large parcel rezoning applications, perhaps housing type and the impact of the development should be considered in the latter case. He noted that the formula was a way to comply with a policy that called for the offset of the impact of new residential development on the public facility system, but that he was not sure if more detail would get anything more or less.

Responding to a question from Chairman Harsel, Commissioner Alcorn said that more detail would include geographic area as well as the cost of construction and land and the level of service.

//

Ms. Byron noted that sample proffers recommended by the Committee and the Schools's staff had been distributed tonight which included a matrix prepared by Donna McNeally, a copy of which is in the date file. She said she hoped that before the next Committee meeting, DPZ staff could work with Schools' staff in an effort to combine the proffers to reflect areas of agreement and areas of differences, with the caveat that that they were only suggestions.

Chairman Harsel called the Committee's attention to the first paragraph of page 1 of "Sample School Proffers, Planning Commission/School Board" revised January 26, 2005, which emphasized that the sample proffers were examples only to address a variety of circumstances and were offered solely as a guide. She suggested that Commissioners talk to their School Board members and their Supervisors to determine what they felt the most comfortable with, pointing out that Commissioners often had to answer to citizens about why developments that caused school overcrowding were approved.

In response to a comment by Commissioner Hart about legislation pending in the General Assembly that would prohibit payments prior to subdivision or site plan approval, Ms. Byron said although staff was not in support of such legislation, it would be acceptable if the money was given with the first building permit or first RUP.

Ms. Byron and Mr. Chevalier responded to questions from Chairman Harsel about the timing of proffer payments and the length of time between approval of the site plan and the commencement of construction.

Chairman Harsel asked if it would be better if the money went into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Speaking from a School Board perspective, Tessie Wilson said she would have no objection if the money was contributed generically to the CIP, but she would be opposed to designating specific projects because if needs changed it would be difficult to move the money. Commissioner de la Fe commented that language could be included to allow the use of the money for some other purpose if it was not needed as originally planned. Mr. Chevalier added that the County should obtain proffer money for capital projects instead of things like computers and agreed that there was language in the sample proffers allowing for money to be moved from one capital project to another.

Ms. Byron commented that the Board of Supervisors wanted the money to be used for capital projects, but at the same time wanted flexibility. Mr. Chevalier said again that the proposed proffers contained language which would allow such flexibility.

Chairman Harsel said another Committee meeting would be scheduled in February or March and she then adjourned the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:19 p.m.
Suzanne F. Harsel, Chairman

For a verbatim record of this meeting, reference may be made to the audio recording which can be found in the Office of the Planning Commission of Fairfax County, Virginia.

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer
Approved on: January 18, 2006

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission